

BRYAN CAVE LEIGHTON PAISNER LLP
120 BROADWAY, SUITE 300
SANTA MONICA, CA 90401-2386

Robert E. Boone III (California Bar No. 132780)
reboone@bclplaw.com
BRYAN CAVE LEIGHTON PAISNER LLP
120 Broadway, Suite 300
Santa Monica, CA 90401-2386
Tel: (310) 576-2100/Fax: (310) 576-2200

Daniel A. Crowe (*Pro Hac Vice*)
dacrowe@bclplaw.com
BRYAN CAVE LEIGHTON PAISNER LLP
One Metropolitan Square
211 N. Broadway, Suite 3600
St. Louis, MO 63102
Tel: (314) 259-2000/Fax (314) 259-2020

Erin A. Kelly (*Pro Hac Vice*)
erin.kelly@bclplaw.com
BRYAN CAVE LEIGHTON PAISNER LLP
1700 Lincoln Street, Suite 4100
Denver, CO 80203
Tel: (303) 861-7000/Fax: (303) 866-0200

Attorneys for Defendants AMP PLUS, INC.
d/b/a Elco Lighting and Elco Lighting, Inc.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DMF, Inc., a California corporation,

Plaintiff,

v.

AMP PLUS, INC., d/b/a ELCO
LIGHTING, a California corporation;
ELCO LIGHTING, INC., a California
corporation,

Defendants.

AND RELATED COUNTER-
ACTIONS.

Case No. 2:18-cv-07090-CAS-GJS

[Hon. Christina A. Snyder]

DEFENDANTS' *EX PARTE*
APPLICATION FOR AN ORDER
STRIKING DMF, INC.'S
UNTIMELY FILED AND
UNTIMELY SERVED MOTION
FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY
JUDGMENT; DECLARATION OF
ROBERT E. BOONE III IN
SUPPORT THEREOF

TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR COUNSEL OF RECORD:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Defendants AMP Plus, Inc. dba Elco Lighting (“ELCO”) and Elco Lighting, Inc. (“ELI”) hereby apply *ex parte* for an order striking Plaintiff DMF, Inc.’s Motion for Partial Summary Judgment and supporting papers (ECF Nos. 345-353) on the grounds that DMF failed to timely file the Motion by the February 3, 2020 deadline, and failed to serve Defendants’ counsel with unredacted copies of the Motion.

Good cause exists for striking the Motion because:

(1) On June 17, 2019, this Court set a January 13, 2020 deadline to file dispositive motions. Minute Order – Further Scheduling Conference (ECF No. 226). On August 21, 2019, the Court, per stipulation of the parties, extended the dispositive motion filing deadline to January 27, 2020. Minute Order (ECF No. 279).

(2) Since September 2019, DMF has repeatedly told this Court that it would be filing a motion for summary judgment forthwith.

(3) Despite those representations, DMF failed to file its summary judgment motion in October, November or December 2019, or in January 2020.

(4) DMF then obtained a one-week extension of the January 27 deadline to February 3, 2020. Minute Order (ECF No. 344).

(5) Despite having had more than ample time to file a summary judgment motion, DMF failed to timely file its Motion.

(6) DMF also failed to timely serve unredacted copies of the Motion.

(7) Defendants should not be burdened with having to respond to an untimely summary judgment motion, especially when DMF could have, as it represented repeatedly, filed the Motion long before the deadline, and at a minimum, in a timely manner compliant with the Court’s scheduling order.

This application is based on the attached memorandum of points and authorities, and the Declaration of Robert E. Boone III.

1 Please take notice that pursuant to Local Rule 7-19, DMF shall have 48 hours
2 from the date of delivery of this application to file and serve any opposition to this
3 application.

4 ELCO's counsel provided oral notice of this application to DMF's counsel on
5 February 4, 2020. DMF will oppose the application.

6
7 Dated: February 4, 2020

BRYAN CAVE LEIGHTON PAISNER LLP

8
9 By: /s/ Robert E. Boone III

Robert E. Boone III

10 Attorneys for Defendants

11 AMP PLUS, INC. d/b/a Elco Lighting and
12 Elco Lighting, Inc.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

BRYAN CAVE LEIGHTON PAISNER LLP
120 BROADWAY, SUITE 300
SANTA MONICA, CA 90401-2386

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

I. INTRODUCTION

Defendants AMP Plus, Inc. dba Elco Lighting (“ELCO”) and Elco Lighting, Inc. (“ELI”) (collectively, “Defendants”) file this *ex parte* application, requesting that the Court strike Plaintiff DMF, Inc.’s (“DMF”) Motion for Partial Summary Judgment (the “Motion”), on the grounds that DMF failed to timely file the Motion, and failed to timely serve unredacted copies of the Motion to Defendants.

II. STATEMENT OF FACTS

On June 17, 2019, this Court set a January 13, 2020 deadline to file dispositive motions. Minute Order – Further Scheduling Conference (ECF No. 226). On August 21, 2019, the Court, per stipulation of the parties, extended the dispositive motion filing deadline to January 27, 2020. Minute Order (ECF No. 279).

Since September 2019, DMF has repeatedly told this Court that it would be filing a motion for summary judgment forthwith. At the November 18, 2019 status conference in DMF’s design patent case against Defendants (*DMF, Inc. v. AMP Plus, Inc. dba Elco Lighting, et al.*, Case No. 2:19-cv-4519-CAS-GJS), DMF again told this Court that it was ready to file its summary judgment motion. In opposition to Defendants Application to Stay the case pending the PTAB’s *inter partes* review of the ‘266 patent, DMF again told this Court that it would be filing its summary judgment motion forthwith: “In sum, what remains of the patent case is very straightforward and most likely will be resolved in whole in part in a few weeks from now by summary judgment.” DMF’s Opposition to Ex Parte Application to Stay the Case at 22 (ECF No. 326 at 27 of 29).

Despite those representations, DMF failed to file its summary judgment motion in October, November or December 2019, or in January 2020.

On January 24, 2020, DMF obtained a one-week extension of the January 27 filing deadline to February 3, 2020. Minute Order (ECF No. 344).

Despite having had more than ample time to file a summary judgment motion in this case, DMF failed to timely file and serve its Motion. Specifically, DMF literally waited until the eleventh hour to file redacted versions of several declarations, a redacted separate statement of uncontroverted facts, and a 3-page notice of the Motion between 10:33 p.m. and 11:47 p.m. on February 3, 2020. *See* ECF Nos. 345-350. On February 4, 2020 – the day after the filing deadline – DMF filed a redacted version of its summary judgment brief (ECF No. 351) and an application to seal unredacted versions of the Motion papers (ECF Nos. 352-353). In addition, DMF did not timely serve Defendants with unredacted copies of the Motion. Declaration of Robert E. Boone III, ¶ 4.

Moreover, despite representing to this Court that its summary judgment motion would be straightforward and simple, DMF's Motion is no such animal. Indeed, DMF waited until the midst of trial preparation deadlines to file a partial summary judgment motion involving a 400-plus paragraph, 189-page expert declaration and a 123-page separate statement of uncontroverted facts and conclusions of law that contains 247 purported uncontroverted facts! *See* ECF Nos. 352-11 and 352-13.

III. ARGUMENT

DMF's Motion was not filed in compliance with the Court's scheduling order. DMF had months to prepare and file its Motion. Indeed, DMF proclaimed to the Court in September 2019 that it was ready to file. DMF advised the Court in November 2019 that its filing of the Motion was imminent. DMF has no valid excuse for failing to timely file and serve its Motion.

Defendants' opposition to the Motion is due this coming Monday, February 10, 2020. Defendants should not be burdened with having to respond to an untimely summary judgment motion, especially one that DMF could have filed long ago. Summary judgment motion filing deadlines are important deadlines and are strictly

1 enforced. Defendants are in the midst of getting prepared for trial, as numerous pre-
 2 trial deadlines loom.

3 **IV. CONCLUSION**

4 For the foregoing reasons, ELCO respectfully requests that the Court strike
 5 DMF's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment on the grounds that DMF failed to
 6 timely file and serve the Motion, in violation of the dispositive motion filing deadline.

7
 8 Dated: February 4, 2019

BRYAN CAVE LEIGHTON PAISNER LLP

9
 10 By: /s/ Robert E. Boone III

Robert E. Boone III

11 Attorneys for Defendants

12 AMP PLUS, INC. d/b/a Elco Lighting and
 13 Elco Lighting, Inc.

BRYAN CAVE LEIGHTON PAISNER LLP
 120 BROADWAY, SUITE 300
 SANTA MONICA, CA 90401-2386

DECLARATION OF ROBERT E. BOONE III

I, Robert E. Boone III, hereby declare as follows:

1. I am an attorney duly licensed to practice law in California and the Central District. I am a partner at the law firm of Bryan Cave Leighton Paisner LLP. I represent Defendants Amp Plus, Inc., dba ELCO Lighting (“ELCO”) and Elco Lighting, Inc. (“ELI”) in the above-captioned case. I have personal knowledge of the matters set forth below. I submit this declaration in support of Defendants’ *Ex Parte* Application for an Order Striking DMF’s Untimely Filed and Unserved Motion for Partial Summary Judgment.

2. At the September 16, 2019 status conference in this matter, DMF’s counsel David Long advised this Court that DMF intended to file, and would be ready to file soon, its motion for summary judgment.

3. At the November 18, 2019 status conference in DMF’s design patent case against Defendants (*DMF, Inc. v. AMP Plus, Inc. dba Elco Lighting, et al.*, Case No. 2:19-cv-4519-CAS-GJS), Mr. Long this Court that DMF intended to file, and was ready to file, its motion for summary judgment.

4. DMF also did not serve Defendants with a complete, unredacted copy of its Motion for Partial Summary Judgment papers until February 4, 2020.

5. I provided oral notice of this application to DMF’s counsel Ben Davidson by telephone on February 4, 2020. Counsel for DMF informed me that DMF will oppose the application.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of California and the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed this 4th day of February 2020, in Santa Monica, California.

/s/ Robert E. Boone III

Robert E. Boone III